

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,451	02/07/2006	Elke Bleuel	284816US0PCT	8658
22850 7590 02/10/2009 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			EXAMINER	
			GILLESPIE, BENJAMIN	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/10/2009	EL ECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/567,451	BLEUEL ET AL.			
	Examiner	Art Unit			
	BENJAMIN J. GILLESPIE	1796			

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 26 January 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

- 1. X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
 - a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 - b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

- 3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 - (a) ☑ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

 - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
 - NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
- The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
- Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the
- non-allowable claim(s). 7. X For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) X will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 - The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 - Claim(s) allowed:
 - Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-20.
 - Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: ___
- AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
- 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
- 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
- 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.
- REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER
- 11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
- Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).

13. Other:

/Rabon Sergent/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796 Continuation of 3. NOTE: The currently proposed amendment will not be entered because the new limitation "said alkaline catalyst" was never previously considered before final, and said limitation does not overcome the prima facie case of obviousness set forth by the examiner.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argue the claimed invention is patentable over the prior art because neither Schilling et al nor Waddington et al teach the claimed method of dissolving an initiator containing both H-functional groups and at least one catalytical active amino group, wherein the dissolving substance is a polyether alcohol. Applicants' go on to state the claimed method produces a polyether having a reduced VOC content and superior molecular weight distribution, as exemplified by applicants exemples 8 and 9.

In the response the examiner would like to first point out that contrary to applicants' position and as previously stated in the final rejection mailed 11/5/2008, column 3 lines 53-57 of Schilling et al do in fact teach the polyether polyol "dissolves" the initiator, i.e. it acts as a solvent.

Regarding the alleged unexpected results set forth by examples 8 and 9 have been noted, however, it is the examiner's position that this data is not representative of the closest prior art. The combination of Schilling et all and Waddington et all is relief upon for the inclusion of the autocatalytic amino initiator in the process of Schilling et all, which already teaches polyether solvent. Applicants' examples, which compare the presence/absence of polyether polyol solvent is not relevant in establishing whether the inclusion of the relied upon initiator of Waddington et all is unobvious.

Furthermore, even if applicants maintain this data is sufficient to show an unexpected advantage over the prior art, the examiner would like to point out that said data is not commensurate in scope with the claimed invention; claim 1 does not even require said solvent to comprise polyether poly.